

Retirement Migration Definitions Matter

Submitted by: [Carolyn S. Wilken](#), Ph.D., M.P.H. , Extension Gerontology

Haas, W. H., Bradley, D. E., Longino, C. F., Stoller, E. P., & Serow, W. J. (2006). In retirement migration, who counts? A methodological question with economic policy implications. *The Gerontologist*, 46(6), 815-820.

In this study Hass and colleagues examined how the implications of various definitions of retirement migration. Although one may think that Shakespeare's admonition that 'a rose by any other name smells as sweet' would apply to describing older adults who we commonly call 'snowbirds'; these researchers found that relying on a traditional age-based definition of retirement migration (people ages 60 and over who move across important political boundaries i.e. county, state, or nation) significantly miscounts the migrant population. Accurate population estimates have important policy and program planning implications, not to mention the structuring/restructuring of political districts.

The researchers identified 3 definitions of older adult migration:

- 1) Traditional Age-based Definition: Retired migrants age 60 and over.
- 2) Retirement-Based Definition 1: Retired migrants aged 50 or older who report working no more than 26 weeks a year and report receiving at least \$1 in Social Security or disability income.
- 3) Retirement-based Definition 2: Retired migrants who are 50 or older who are not in the labor force and report receiving at least \$1 in Social Security or disability income.

Using data from the long-form of the 2000 U.S. Census the authors found that using the traditional definition of retirement migration excludes those who retire earlier, at ages 50-59. Using retirement rather than age as a qualifier, the actual number of retired migrants was 21% less.

Florida, Arizona, California, Texas and North Carolina are the five top retirement migration hosts, or receiving states. A comparison of the rates of migration between each definition (for Florida) revealed important differences between definitions suggesting that specifying actual working/retirement status reduces the real number of older (50 years and older) migrants coming into Florida.



“So what?” you may ask.

Understanding the employment status of older migrants to a community leads to a better understanding of the economic impact of migration. Retirees bring with them transfer payments such as Social Security, private pensions, and equity income, as well as Medicare and generate what is known as a mailbox economy. Those who are fully retired bring those assets into a community and do not compete with the indigenous workforce for jobs. Those who are still working, even part-time have a different impact on the economy. Using all three definitions of migration, the researchers found that fewer partially retired people migrate to Florida than Texas and California, therefore having less impact on the workforce.

Implications for County FCS Faculty

County faculty are frequently involved in county-level community development and are responsible for the development of their own programs. Recognizing the differences in how migration is calculated provides faculty with important information to contribute to those planning processes. This study which utilized data from the U.S. Census reminds us of the wealth of information available from the census data. To find data related to many aspects of your county or community (i.e. age distribution, education levels, income, housing costs, etc.) follow this link [http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html? lang=en](http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?lang=en) to the *American Community Survey* and enter your city or county. In the past, the census data was unusable to most professionals, but now census data is presented in a very user-friendly format and is therefore not only accessible it is also usable! Data presented in the *American Community Survey* reflects the issues of concern to FCS agents and can be very helpful in developing needs assessments, preparing situation statements for Plans of Work, and for prioritizing programs.

How Do I Know that a Product is Really “Organic”?

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) developed legal rules about organic foods that went into effect about three years ago. These rules are very detailed and carry a stiff fine -- \$10,000 – for labeling any food product “organic” unless the USDA standards for organic production are met. The rules cover how the food was produced, how it was processed, and even how it is transported. Every organic food product sold in the United States, regardless of where it was produced, must meet USDA’s standards. Any use of the term “organic” to describe a food product requires meeting USDA standards.

What Are the Standards?

The standards are very detailed. They cover things like the cleaning materials that can be used on machinery, how to store and transport organic products to make sure they do not come into contact with conventionally produced items, and how to protect water quality. You can find a copy of the standards at <http://www.ams.usda.gov/nop/NOP/NOPhome.html>.

What Should I Look For?

Every organic food product must have a certification label on it. This will be a small, usually inconspicuous, label that gives the name of the certifying agency and provides information about how to contact the certifier. Here is an example:



The product may also carry the USDA Organic logo, but this is not required. More and more producers are using this logo because it is highly visible and more easily recognized by most consumers.



Private certifiers, or, in some cases, state departments of agriculture, not the USDA are responsible for certification. All of these certifiers are, however, accredited by the USDA. This means that the USDA has verified that the certifier follows all of the procedures that USDA requires for certification and that the



<http://fyics.ifas.ufl.edu>

certifier does know and understand the USDA standards for organic production, processing and transportation. You can find a complete list of the certifiers at <http://www.ams.usda.gov/nop/CertifyingAgents/Accredited.html>. There are currently 95 certifying agencies for USDA, 50 domestic and 45 international.

What Does Certification Mean?

Any farm or company that produces an organic product must go through an inspection process. The farmer or producer applies for certification by filling out a lengthy application form that explains everything that he/she has done and will do to meet the national organic standards.

Let's take a farm as an example. A farmer must have followed all of the rules and regulations for organic production for at least three years. The application indicates what the farmer has done in the past, and what he/she will do in the coming year. The farmer provides a new application for re-certification every year. If the farmer's plan meets the requirements for certification, an inspector goes to the farm to make sure that the practices that the farmer said are being used actually are being used – and to make sure that there are no violations of any of the organic standards on the farm. If a farmer fails to meet the standards, decertification follows.

Can I Be Sure?

Consumers must look for the certification label on a product to make absolutely sure that it meets the USDA standards. If someone sells a product at a farmers' market, they should have a copy of the certification documentation for you to see. It is true that farmers who sell less than \$5,000 worth of products per year can use the term organic – as long as they meet all of the USDA standards – but do not have to be certified. Packaged products must have the certifier's seal on them. While there is a stiff penalty for calling a product "organic" that does not meet USDA's requirements, as is so often the case, the consumer must be vigilant and look for the seal. If you suspect that a product is being labeled organic that is not certified, you should contact the USDA and file a complaint. The contact information and procedure is available at <http://www.ams.usda.gov/nop/Compliance/FileComplaint.html>.

Child Care for Children with Disabilities

DeVore, S. & Bowers, B. (2007). Childcare for children with disabilities. *Infants & Young Children, 19*(3), 203-212.

Submitted by: Suzanna Smith, Ph.D., MSW, CFLE, Associate Professor, Human Development

Working parents often face difficult choices about how to take care of their children when they are at work. They often search for the “right” childcare provider, someone who will meet their child’s needs, and someone they can afford, at a convenient location.

What about the difficulties that working parents of children with disabilities face? Finding childcare can be especially challenging for these families, because they need a provider that can accommodate their child’s special needs, in addition to being affordable and of good quality.

According to DeVore and Bowers (2006) in their recent study published in *Infants and Young Children*, “about 60% of mothers of children with disabilities are employed and need...childcare” (p. 203). In this exploratory study with a small sample of parents of children with disabilities and childcare providers, researchers looked closely at how families of children with disabilities find, choose, and maintain the childcare they need.

Methods

The researchers conducted in-depth interviews with 18 parents and 4 childcare providers who cared for children with disabilities. They located the sample through two resource and referral agencies and 2 early intervention programs. With grounded theory to guide the study, the researchers asked unstructured open-ended questions and then revised these questions based on what they were learning from the research. Interviews were audio taped and transcribed. Line by line dimensional analysis of the interviews brought out themes and enable comparisons. Summaries of results were mailed to participants and were clarified during follow-up interviews. A panel of researchers also coded and reviewed the transcripts and analyses to verify the results.

Results

All families selected for the study had at least one child age 6 or younger, with developmental delays and/or special healthcare needs such as such as autism spectrum disorder, cerebral palsy, and speech delay. All families used from 20-45 hours of non-parental care per week in one or a combination of the following: center based childcare,



family childcare in the child care provider's home, care in a relative's home, a preschool program at a school, in-home therapeutic services, or a nanny in the family's home (p. 205). Most families lived in metropolitan areas in the county where the study was conducted

Like other working parents, these families first created a pool of providers based on professional and personal recommendations. When narrowing down their pool, they looked at practical factors such as cost, and group size. Then parents screened providers, usually over the phone, and followed up with a visit to childcare facilities they liked.

Parents were, as could be expected, looking for a provider "who could meet their child's special developmental needs" (p. 208). Yet, while most families cycled through several different childcare arrangements, trying to find childcare that worked for them, a few found successful childcare situations the first time (p. 208). What made the difference? In lasting childcare arrangements, parents weren't just looking for specialized care, but for a cooperative relationship with the childcare provider. Those parents and providers quickly built a *partnership* and worked together to solve problems. These partnering parents and providers were lucky in other ways, too—the parents had flexible work schedules, a supportive adult living with them, and a second income so they could take the time to find the right provider and resolve issues that might arise. Families that were less successful "were often under time pressures to find care," had financial limitations, and "felt somewhat isolated" (p. 210).

Conclusions

The study found that partnerships between parents and childcare providers were an important factor in successful childcare arrangements for children with disabilities. They also point out that families need specific resources to manage their searches including "time, adults support, and economic stability" (p. 210). Having access to these resources enabled families to take the time to find successful childcare. The researchers recommend that families contact childcare information and referral services for individualized help in locating the kind of care the family needs and other resources in the community that can help.

Implications for Extension

Extension can work with childcare resource and referral agencies, early intervention specialists, and providers to offer training on improving parent-provider communication and developing partnerships for caring for children with disabilities. In parent education programs, Extension faculty can encourage parents of children with disabilities to develop a system for identifying potential childcare providers; and for finding a provider the family can talk with openly, and who is willing to work with parents to solve problems. Extension can work with childcare resource and referral agencies, children's coalitions, and policy makers, to bring to light the childcare needs of children with disabilities.

Do Couples at High Risk of Relationship Problems Attend Premarriage Education?

Submitted by: Heidi Liss Radunovich, PhD, Assistant Professor of Human Development

Halford, W.K., O'Donnell, C., Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K.L. (2006). Do couples at high risk of relationship problems attend premarriage education? [Electronic version] *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20, 160-163.

Introduction

Although studies suggest that most couples benefit from premarital education, the research literature suggests that couples who are at risk for marital problems are the ones who benefit most from premarital education. However, are those who are at higher risk for marital problems likely to obtain premarital education? This study examined whether factors associated with higher risk for divorce had an impact on whether or not couples obtained premarital education.

Methodology

This study was conducted in Australia. In order to recruit participants, all newly married couples within an Australian state were contacted 6 weeks after marriage if they were married within 3 randomly selected months over the course of about a year and a half. A total of 6,656 couples were married during that time frame, and were contacted regarding the study. Of those couples, only 447 couples volunteered to participate in the study.

A total of 384 couples completed all study procedures. Income and education of this sample were slightly higher than for the general population of Australia, but slightly lower than would be expected for a United States population. Participants completed a battery of measures that asked about demographic information, whether or not any type of premarital education was received, and specific measures of relationship adjustment and aggression.

Main Ideas

The two variables that consistently predicted attendance at marriage education were religious service attendance and not living together prior to marriage. Living together before marriage has been associated with poorer marital outcome, and religious

attendance has been associated with better marital outcome. Level of education, age, history of parental divorce, having a prior marriage, aggression in the relationship, and stability of the relationship did not predict attendance at premarital education. Overall, the data suggests that those couples with higher risk factors for divorce were less likely to attend premarital education than those with lower risk factors. It is important to keep in mind that this study was conducted in a different country (Australia), and that those couples who volunteered to participate in this study (only about 6% of the total number eligible) might be somewhat different from the general population. However, it is notable that, similar to the US, Australia does not provide free, easy access to premarital education. Therefore, it is understandable that many of those who received premarital education likely did so through their religious institution, and may have been required to do so in order to get married by their religious institution. Interestingly, the researchers did not comment on the types of premarital education used, nor do they describe the length or type of education available.

Implications for Extension Programs

The State of Florida provides an incentive for premarital education by providing a discount in the cost of the marriage license to those Florida couples who receive premarital education. However, this does not mean that premarital education is widely available at a low cost. Cooperative Extension within the state of Florida provides the Before You Tie the Knot premarital education program at low or no cost, but this program is only available in a few select counties. Furthermore, it is unclear whether those most at risk would participate in such a program, even when offered at free or reduced cost. Although it would be helpful to increase the availability of the Before You Tie the Knot program to other counties, perhaps efforts should be made to increase the availability of the program information via multiple formats (in person, virtual, self-taught via written materials or video) so that those who can't easily attend a premarital program in person, or who would feel uncomfortable doing so, could receive premarital education through alternative methods. Finally, tailoring the materials to meet the need of various types of couples, including those from other cultures and with various levels of literacy, would help reach a wider audience (Ooms & Wilson, 2004).

Conclusion

Quality premarital education has been associated with improved marital satisfaction (Jakubowski, Milne, Brunner & Miller, 2004). However, those couples who may benefit most from premarital education may be less likely to receive premarital education. Attempts to increase availability through traditional as well as alternative methods would be beneficial.

Additional References

Research News You Can Use
January 2007

- Jakubowski, S.F., Milne, E.P., Brunner, H., & Miller, R.B. (2004). A review of empirically supported marital enrichment programs [Electronic version]. *Family Relations*, 53, 528-536.
- Ooms, T., & Wilson, P. (2004). The challenges of offering relationship and marriage education to low-income populations [Electronic version]. *Family Relations*, 53, 440-447.
- Peacock, D., & Radunovich, H. (2006). So You Are Getting Married in Florida! EDIS publication FCS 2179.

Research News You Can Use

Is Your Home Safe for Your Children?

Submitted by: Hyun-Jeong Lee, Ph.D., Assistant Professor/Housing Specialist

Phelan, K. J., J. Khoury, H. Kalkwarf, and B. Lanphear. January-February 2005.
"Residential Injuries in U.S. Children and Adolescents." *Public Health Reports* 120: 63-70.

Introduction

A house is the primary built-environment for a human being (Aragonés 2002). A house plays important roles to those who reside there not only as a shelter providing security and protection from harm (Aragonés; Betchel 1997). However, is your home safe enough for you and your children? One of the recent reports indicates that the leading cause of the U.S. children's death is injury and the home is the most common place for the children's injuries (Phelan, Khoury, Kalkwarf & Lanphear 2005).

Methodology

The purpose of the study by Phelan et al. (2005) was to investigate the trends of unintentional residential injury for U.S. children. Data was obtained from the National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics. From the NHAMCS data, a sample of patients under age 20 at the time of survey who visited to emergency departments (EDs) between 1993 and 1999 were drawn and analyzed using statistical techniques including chi-square tests.

Main Ideas

Children's Injuries between 1993 and 1999

From 1993 to 1999, average 29 million children < 20 years visited EDs annually. Injury accounted 39% of the children emergency visits and 35% of the total children emergency visits were reported as unintentional injury visits. The home was found to be the most common location of the unintentional child injury, accounting for 4 million ED visit annually. Fortunately, the number of the children's ED visits for unintentional injuries decreased by 24% from 4.7 millions in 1993 to 3.5 millions in 1999. However, the number is still high. Children age under 5 showed the greatest number (1.7 millions) and highest rate (43%) of ED visits for unintentional residential injuries. Males showed a higher rate of the ED visits than females.

Mechanism, Type, and Severity of the Children Residential Injuries

Among the children's ED visits due to any residential injuries, falls were found to be the most frequent mechanism, accounting for 38% of the visits. "Struck/strike" and "cutting/piercing" were the second and third frequent mechanism of the ED visits.

The most commonly injured regions of the body from residential injuries were extremities, head and necks. The most frequent types of injury were an open wound or superficial injury, contusions/crush injuries and fracture/dislocation (Phelan et al., p.66). More than 10% of the annual children ED visits were for "moderate-to-severe" injuries (Phelan et al., p.67).

Suggestions for the Residential Injury Prevention

The researchers of the study suggested that many of the children's injuries at home can be prevented by using safety devices such as stairway gates, improving home design, and by providing

appropriate parental supervision (p.67). In addition, it was suggested that safety of home products needs to be ensured.

Implications for Extension Programs

Considering young children (age under 5) showed the highest rate of the children's ED visits, safety education needs to be emphasized in education programs of parents of the young children and prospective parents. Also, home remodeling/modification programs and education materials need to include safety features and products related to children's in- and around-home safety. In addition, consumer education needs to be focused on appropriate purchase, installation and use of home products.

Conclusion

Traditionally, the main image of a home includes a shelter providing protection from outside harms. However, a recent research study by Phelan et al. (2005) revealed that home was a not-so-safe place for the U.S. children. Although the number of children residential injuries was found to be decreased over the years, home is still the most common location for the children injuries in the United States. More attention and efforts are required to make your home a safer place for you and your children to live.

Additional References

Aragonés, J. I. 2002. The Dwelling as Place: Behaviors and Symbolism. In *Residential Environments: Choice, Satisfaction and Behavior*, edited by J. I. Aragonés and T. Gärling. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Bechtel, R. B. 1997. *Environment and Behavior: An Introduction*. Edited by Robert B. Bechtel. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

The Protective Role of Grandparents: A Valuable Intergenerational Resource

Submitted by: Kate Fogarty, Ph.D., Youth Development, FYCS

Introduction

The role grandparents play in children's development is an increasingly recognized phenomenon in the U.S., as well as other developed nations. For example, nearly 6% of children reside in homes where grandparents are the head of household (U.S. Census, 2001) and there has been a recent, steep increase in grandparents serving as surrogate parents to their grandchildren (Fuller-Thomson & Minkler, 2000). The increase is attributed to a number of dire conditions affecting parents/children of grandparents such as: (1) death, divorce, child abuse, drug use and incarceration (Edwards & Daire, 2006); and (2) grandparents are the most willing of any family member to take grandchildren into their home (Edwards, 1998).

Beyond the influence, grandparents have on their grandchildren while they raise them – such as academic success and psychological well-being (Edwards, 2003) – grandparents also affect grandchildren *even when they do not live under the same roof*. When children face high risk situations such as poverty and parental mental illness, grandparents can make a difference by positively affecting a child's development. Notably, recent findings support how grandparents buffer the negative effects of high risk on children. High risk settings that include: poverty, parental mental illness, and stressful family events are found to be correlates and causes of maternal depression (Silverstein & Ruiz, 2006). Maternal depression has notable negative effects on parenting and children's functioning, effects which have been found to be lessened by grandchildren's sense of emotional closeness to their grandparents.

Maternal Depression and Family Relationships

Maternal depression affects children through family relationships by how parents and children interact with one another (Davies & Windle, 1997; Nelson, Hammen, Brennan, & Ullman, 2003). Compared to nondepressed mothers, depressed mothers are found to respond:

- minimally or inconsistently with their children;
- express more negative emotions with their children; and
- are less engaged when interacting with their children (Petterson & Albers, 2001).

Like poverty, maternal depression:

- inhibits children's cognitive development (Petterson & Albers, 2001);
- worsens their behavior problems (Elgar, Curtis, McGrath, Waschbusch, & Stewart, 2003; Zuckerman & Beardslee, 1987);
- influences teens' acting out behaviors and impairs their functioning in social and academic roles (Nelson, et al., 2003).

Depressive symptoms reported by mothers are associated with adolescent daughters' (but not sons') experiences with depression, behavioral problems, and academic difficulties (Davies & Windle, 1997). Mothers' reports of depression when children are school-aged and adolescents had negative effects on psychological functioning and educational attainment for adult sons and daughters (Ensminger, Hanson, Riley, & Juon, 2003). Moreover, mother's depression when children were school-aged to young adult was significantly related to children's reports of depression in young adulthood (Silverstein & Ruiz, 2006). Similar to the timing effects found with poverty, the longer a period of time a child experiences maternal depression, the more negative developmental effects result (Petterson & Albers, 2001).

Maternal depression has clearly been established as a risk factor for poor child, adolescent, and young adult (e.g., developmental) outcomes. For example, a national, representative longitudinal study has found that being (Silverstein & Ruiz, 2006):

- female;
- unmarried vs. married and cohabiting;
- cohabiting vs. married;
- depressed in childhood; and
- having a depressed mother as a child,

each increased the likelihood that children would be depressed as young adults.

Grandparent(s) as Protective Factor

However, this same study shows that a child's relationship with his or her grandparent(s) is a source of protection or a protective factor. For example, a grandchild's:

- sense of emotional closeness to their grandparent(s);
- frequency of contact with grandparent(s); and
- view of their grandparent(s) as a source of social support, together buffer the

“intergenerational effect” of maternal depression on children (Silverstein & Ruiz, 2006).

In other words, for children with depressed mothers, the higher a child's sense of “social cohesion” with their grandparent(s), measured by the above three factors, the less likely he or she is to experience depression in adulthood. Or, among all children, the link between depressive symptoms of mothers and children was found to be weakened by the presence of strong grandparent-grandchild relationships.

Notable protective factors pinpointed in resilience research include: availability of community support networks, the presence of caring adults, possession of high intelligence, and having high self-esteem; these protective factors have caught the attention of youth interventionists and prevention researchers. Decreasing the influence of risk factors and increasing or providing the presence of protection in the lives of at-risk youth is a main goal of intervention. There is logic in targeting those protective factors found in youth development research as part of treatment and prevention for youth at risk (Wolkow & Ferguson, 2001); however, setbacks occur due to limited knowledge of how to influence underlying processes that buffer risk and stress in the lives of youth (Rutter, 1993).

Implications for Extension

In light of the recent findings of the protective function of grandparents on youth outcomes, Extension educators can (adapted from Silverstein & Ruiz, 2006):

- Consider ways to mobilize family resources toward the extended, and beyond the nuclear, family;
- Emphasize the importance of intergenerational relationships in families;
- Incorporate ways for intergenerational family participation in programs;
- Encourage the volunteerism of older adults in the community (e.g., as “surrogate” grandparents to individual youth or youth programs); and
- Make use of multigenerational resources in their programs.

References:

Davies, P.T., & Windle, M. (1997). Gender-specific pathways between maternal depressive symptoms, family discord, and adolescent adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 657-668.

January 2007

Kate Fogarty

- Edwards, O.W. & Daire, A.P. (2006). School-age children raised by their grandparents: Problems and solutions. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 33, 113-119.
- Edwards, O.W. (1998). Helping grandchildren raised by grandparents: Expanding psychology in the schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35, 173-181.
- Edwards, O.W. (2003). Living with grandma: A grandfamily study. *School Psychology International*, 24, 204-217.
- Elgar, F.J., Curtis, L.J., McGrath, P.J., Waschbusch, D.A., & Stewart, S.H. (2003). Antecedent-consequence conditions in maternal mood and child adjustment: A four-year cross-lagged study. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 32, 362-374.
- Ensminger, M.E., Hanson, S.G., Riley, A. W., & Juon, H.S. (2003). Maternal psychological distress: Adult sons' and daughters' mental health and educational attainment. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 42, 1108-1115.
- Fuller-Thomson, E., & Minkler, M. (2000). America's grandparent caregivers: Who are they? In B. Hayslip Jr. & R. Goldberg-Glen (Eds.), *Grandparents raising grandchildren: Theoretical, empirical, and clinical perspectives* (pp. 3-21). New York, NY: Springer.
- Nelson, D.R., Hammen, C., Brennan, P.A., & Ullman, J.B. (2003). The impact of maternal depression on adolescent adjustment: The role of expressed emotion. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 935-944.
- Petterson, S.M. & Albers, A.B. (2001). Effects of poverty and maternal depression on early child development. *Child Development*, 72, 1974-1813.
- Rutter, M. (1993). Resilience: Some conceptual considerations. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 14, 626-631.
- Silverstein, M., & Ruiz, S. (2006). Breaking the chain: How grandparents moderate the transmission of maternal depression to their grandchildren. *Family Relations*, 55, 601-612.
- United States Census Bureau. (2001). Census 2000 Supplementary Survey: Profile of selected social characteristics. Available: <http://www.census.gov/c2ss/www/products...les/2000/tabular/c2sstable2/01000us.htm>.
- Wolkow, K.E., & Ferguson, H.B. (2001). Community factors in the development of resiliency: Considerations and future directions. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 37, 489-498.
- Zuckerman, B.S., & Beardslee, W.R. (1987). Maternal depression: A concern for pediatricians. *Pediatrics*, 79, 110-117.

Frictionless Fundraising: How the Internet can Bring Fundraising back into Balance. Michael C. Gilbert, January, 2003. Nonprofit Online News is a program of The Gilbert Center at <http://news.gilbert.org>.

Submitted by: [E.B. Bolton](#), Ph.D., Professor, Community Development.

Michael Gilbert reaches the nonprofit community with his electronic newsletter containing articles, workshop opportunities and solicitations for his organization. This article seemed particularly appropriate for faculty involved with community based organizations working on fund raising campaigns. It emphasizes a back to basics approach that combines technology with the four elements of professional fund raising.

Gilbert starts with the caution that it is inappropriate to start with explaining the technology but to begin with defining fundraising. He uses a mapping concept as a four part diagram that depicts a series of stages of communication with a potential donor. The map begins with moving the donor through the first stage called "prospecting" which is the act of "initiating a relationship with a prospective donor." (p. 2) This stage includes marketing and promotion. "Cultivating" follows the prospect stage and here the relationship is developed with the donor so that the appeal might have a better chance to be successful. "Asking" follows the cultivate stage and this is the formal request for a donation. "Stewardship" is the process of nurturing the relationship with the prospect or the donor over time.

Gilbert's point is that modern fundraising is not working as well as we are led to believe, i.e. it is out of balance. Fundraising for most organizations involves costly communications with donors which creates an environment that is in a state of constant friction. He says that the communication stages are out of alignment because the emphasis is on the "ask" part of the equation. Most fund raisers are obsessed with the asking part of the equation and give very little attention to the other three parts, particularly the processes of cultivation and stewardship. The "ask" becomes increasing urgent with every new campaign and it increases as the goals get higher. Only the major donors have a balanced relationship with the organization because they are treated with respect. All other donors are treated as sources of money. Balanced means that the four parts of the equation are equal although not necessarily the same with all donors.

Accepting credit card transactions is a great way to increase online fundraising but it does little to give balance to the four part fund raising equation. Gilbert says that the capability to raise funds through the internet could be limiting to the organization because it gives little attention to the donor's need for cultivation and continued stewardship and therein lies the danger of relying exclusively on technology as a fund raising. Letting technology drive the fund raising effort put an emphasis on the capabilities of technology and ignores the human aspects of the organization primarily the donors and the staff who



deal with them. Gilbert notes this emphasis shifts the fundraising to technology support staff and away from the fund raising professionals.

He makes the point that credit card transactions are not fundraising and this perception that they are creates an imbalance by combining the worst aspect of fundraising with available technology. This approach will raise funds but because of the scale of unsolicited email, it also has the potential of creating spam and throwing the fund raising equation further out of balance. The use of internet technology is the direction many nonprofit are going rather than creating a system of communication with their stakeholders that goes far beyond receiving an email solicitation. Gilbert says this is the philosophy of a quick return on the dollar similar to that of direct mail campaigns. Both of these practices will be detrimental to the organization because it erodes goodwill of the public and prevent online fundraising from being successful to the extent it might be otherwise.

The potential exists, according to Gilbert, to treat every donor like a major donor. "Prospect" them with respect and permission. "Cultivate" them in a personal way. "Ask" for the right amount at the right time. "Steward" the relationship in such a way that loyalty from the donor is created and lasts for a long time. This balanced equation decreases two costs, communication and personalization. He proposes the integration of email, the web, and selected databases will reduce the cost to reach potential donors. The nonprofit incurs the cost of email, web sites and building databases. The donor will supply the stewardship to sustain the relationship through email and web site visits. He says this plan maintains the four stages of the fund raising equation and reduces the friction of fundraising by restoring equilibrium to the process.

No longer will "prospecting" be on just new donors. The emphasis will be on developing lists of donors that have been approached with respect and permission. This will be done through a process called "chaperoning" rather than renting email lists. Nonprofits will "cultivate" these relationships by redesigning websites and the messages they send out so that it is not campaign on fundraising but on developing relationships. The "ask" becomes much easier because the prospecting and cultivation stage has been carefully crafted and carried out. All this work will be rewarded as the nonprofit develops and maintains a stewardship approach to the donors. Funding solicitations will not be combined with news about events or birthday greetings. From this process it will be learned how the donors want the nonprofit to be stewards of their donations.

Gilbert says nonprofits need to get back to basic theory of successful fundraising that does not lose sight of the human element. Technology is a wonderful tool but it should be used effectively to create communications with real people on the other end. In that way it will seem frictionless because all the elements in the equation are balanced and operate in harmony. Relationships are the most important part of fund raising and technology will not replace these but if used appropriately and effectively it will enhance nonprofit donor relationships.

Potential Impacts of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans – 2005 on American Agriculture

Submitted by: [Linda B. Bobroff](#), Ph.D., RD, LD/N, Professor and Extension Nutrition Specialist

Introduction

The Dietary Guidelines for Americans (Dietary Guidelines) provide research-based dietary advice designed to promote health and reduce risk for the major chronic conditions and diseases that affect people in the U.S., including obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, high blood pressure, cancer, and osteoporosis. The Dietary Guidelines are the cornerstone of federal nutrition policy and influence the numerous food and nutrition programs of the federal government. These include the Food Stamp Program, Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program. The latest edition of the Dietary Guidelines was introduced in 2005.

Most Americans do not consume diets that are consistent with the recommendations of the *Dietary Guidelines for Americans – 2005 (DG-2005)*. Nutrition education, such as that provided by Extension educators, can help consumers make healthful food choices to meet the DG-2005, within the context of their usual food patterns and cultural preferences. A recent report from USDA's Economic Research Service (ERS) indicates that changes in food intake patterns to meet these recommendations have implications for American agriculture, which may be of interest to Extension and its partners.

Food Group Recommendations of DG-2005

The DG-2005 (1) encourages Americans to consume more fruits, vegetables (with specific recommendations for the five sub-groups of vegetables), fat-free or low-fat milk or milk products, and whole-grain products, while staying within caloric recommendations. These food group recommendations are outlined in the MyPyramid Food Guidance System, which was introduced in April 2005 (2) and which is available at <http://mypyramid.gov>. The amounts recommended constitute alterations in consumption of food from these food groups for many Americans, and thus have implications for American agriculture (3). Within USDA's Food Guidance System, food patterns are based on calorie needs. For a person consuming a 2,000 calorie per day diet, the amounts recommended from these four food groups are as follows:



Fruits: 2 cups
Vegetables: 2 ½ cups
Grains: 6 ounce equivalents (eat at least 3 ounce equivalents of whole grain foods)
Milk: 3 cups (choose fat-free or low-fat)

Note: The fifth food group is Meats and Beans, and at the 2,000 calorie per day level, the recommended intake is 5 ½ ounce equivalents. Most people consume an adequate amount of protein, one of the key nutrients provided by this food group, but eat beans infrequently, and increased intake of beans is recommended (this is included in the recommendation to increase vegetable consumption, since beans are included in both food groups).

The average American diet falls short of the daily recommendations for fruits, vegetables (except for starchy vegetables which are over-consumed), whole grains, and milk and milk products in the DG-2005 and in the supporting MyPyramid Food Guidance System. The ERS report indicates that “if Americans were to bring their diets fully in line with these recommendations, changes in the mix and quantity of foods produced in the United States would undergo some major shifts.”

What Did The Study Find?

The following findings are reprinted from the [ERS report](#) (3):

If Americans were to fully meet the Guidelines' recommendations for fruits, vegetables, total grains, and whole grains, U.S. agriculture would need to harvest 7.4 million additional acres of cropland per year, an increase of 1.7 percent of total U.S. cropland in 2002. Additionally, U.S. dairy farmers would need to raise annual production of milk and milk products by an estimated 108 million pounds (about a 65 percent increase) for Americans to meet recommendations for dairy consumption. Such an increase in dairy demand would likely require an increase in the number of dairy cows, an increase in the volume of feed grains needed, and, possibly, an increase in the acreage devoted to dairy production.

Fruit. *Americans would need to increase daily fruit consumption by 132 percent to meet the new dietary recommendations. The additional demand could require U.S. producers to more than double harvested fruit acreage to 7.6 million acres (from 3.5 million). U.S. fruit production is constrained by land, labor, and climate, making it likely that imports would continue to increase as a share of the total U.S. fruit supply.*

Vegetables. *To meet the new recommendations for vegetables, Americans' daily vegetable consumption would need to rise by about 31 percent and the mix of vegetables consumed would need to change. For example, consumption of legumes would have to increase by 431 percent, and consumption of starchy vegetables would have to decline by 35 percent. To meet this increased demand, the area harvested for vegetables in the United States would need to increase by about 135 percent from 6.5 million acres to 15.3 million acres.*

Milk and milk products. Americans would need to increase their consumption of dairy products, including fat-free or low-fat milks and equivalent milk products (e.g., nonfat yogurt) by 66 percent (requiring an additional 111 billion pounds of milk per year) to meet the new dietary recommendations. Domestic production could account for 108 billion pounds of that increase, most likely by expanding dairy cow inventories, an action counter to long-term industry trends.

Whole grains. To meet the dietary recommendations, Americans would need to increase their daily consumption of whole grains by an estimated 248 percent and reduce their consumption of total grains by about 27 percent. Because it takes less raw wheat to produce a whole-grain product than a similar refined-grain product and because of the decline in total grain intake, the overall drop in demand could translate to producers harvesting about 5.6 million fewer acres of wheat each year.

As noted above, the DG-2005 do not recommend an increase in meat consumption, and for many people, to meet the recommended intake from the Meat and Beans groups, they likely would need to decrease their meat consumption and increase consumption of legumes and fish. This ERS analysis did not include effects of meat, fats and oils, or caloric sweeteners, although one might expect possible implications for agriculture from these changes as well.

Implications for Extension

Extension has its roots in agriculture and agriculture still is a primary focus of Extension programming. The findings of this ERS report are interesting in that they bridge what may sometimes be considered a gap between Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) (specifically Nutrition) programs and Agriculture programs in Extension. Although the focus of these programs, their target audiences, and their very nature vary, this report indicates that there is a mutual interest (or concern) that may warrant exploration.

Nutrition education programs and interventions are carried out to help consumers implement dietary guidelines that are jointly developed by the USDA and US Department of Health and Human Services for the purpose of improving the health and well-being of Americans. Programs are based on the most current research in the area of diet and health, and not based on potential impacts on agriculture at the national or even local level. Still, it is helpful for Extension FCS educators, who are primary providers of Extension nutrition education programs, to be familiar with potential implications for agriculture of the recommendations that they make as part of their nutrition programming, particularly when local commodities might be impacted. Collaborative programming with FCS and Agriculture Extension agents to explore these issues may open the door to enhanced communications between professionals in these two fields.

References

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture. *Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2005*. 6th Edition, Washington, DC: U.S. Government

Printing Office, January 2005. Available at:

<http://www.mypyramid.gov/guidelines/index.html>

2. U.S. Department of Agriculture. MyPyramid. 2005. Available at:
<http://www.pyramid.gov>.
3. Buzby JC, Hodan FW and Vocke G. *Possible Implications for U.S. Agriculture from Adoption of Select Dietary Guidelines*. Economic Research Report No. ERR-31, November 2006. Available at: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/ERR31/>.